



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,629	12/09/2003	Phyllis J. Michaelides	07002.0053.N	4733
23369	7590	10/06/2005	EXAMINER	
HOWREY LLP			SHERKAT, AREZOO	
C/O IP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	
2941 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 200			PAPER NUMBER	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042-7195			2131	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/731,629	Applicant(s) MICHAELIDES, PHYLLIS J.	
	Examiner Arezo Sherkat	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/9/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

*AT*

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-31 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gupta et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 and Gupta hereinafter).

Regarding claims 1, 3, and 14, Gupta discloses a generic token-based system for integrating a target application on a first server to an authentication system for authenticating users of the target application, the generic system comprising a second server coupled to a database of configuration information about a login process for the target application, the second server being programmed to access the database of configuration information to conduct the login process with a user of the target application and to use the authentication system to authenticate the user and to issue at least one token to enable the user to access the target application once the authentication system authenticates the user, wherein the second server is programmed to receive a Uniform Resource Locator including an identification of the target application, and the second server is further programmed to use the identification

of the target application for looking up the configuration information for the login process from the database (Col. 3, lines 22-67 and Col. 4, lines 1-50).

Regarding claims 18, 27, and 31, Gupta discloses a method of using an authentication system for authenticating users of a target application on a first server, the method comprising maintaining a database of configuration information about a login process for the target application, and using a second server to access the database of configuration information to conduct the login process with a user of the target application and to use the authentication system to authenticate the user and to issue at least one token to enable the user to access the target application once the authentication system has authenticated the user, wherein a data network couples the first server to the second server, and the second server receives a Uniform Resource Locator including an identification of the target application and uses the identification of the target integrated with the authentication system, and pages for creating and editing a selected one of the target applications (Col. 11, lines 25-67, Col.12, lines 1-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-19).

Regarding claims 2 and 19, Gupta discloses wherein the authentication system is a centralized authentication system of a business organization, and the target application is in a third-party web server coupled by a network to the centralized authentication system, and the login process includes redirection of a user login request

from the third-party web server to a server accessing the database and the centralized authentication system (Col. 11, lines 25-67, Col.12, lines 1-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-19).

Regarding claims 4 and 20, Gupta discloses wherein the configuration database includes configuration information for configuring a plurality of applications to the authentication system, the target application transmits a Uniform Resource Locator including an identification of the target application, and the method includes obtaining the identification of the target application from the Uniform Resource Locator, and using the identification of the target application for looking up the configuration information for the target application from the database (Col. 11, lines 25-67, Col.12, lines 1-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-19).

Regarding claims 5, 15, 21, and 28, Gupta discloses wherein the server is programmed to obtain from the database configuration information defining an inbound parameter, and the server is programmed to receive the inbound parameter from the target application (Col. 5, lines 43-67 and Col. 6, lines 1-45).

Regarding claims 6, 16, 22, and 29, Gupta discloses wherein the server is programmed to obtain from the database configuration information defining a natural language, and the server is programmed to use the natural language for communication with the user during the login process (Col. 2, lines 15-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-14).

Regarding claims 7, 17, 23, and 30, Gupta discloses wherein the server is programmed to obtain from the database configuration information defining an outbound parameter, and the server is programmed to send the outbound parameter to the target application once the authentication system has authenticated the user (Col. 5, lines 43-67 and Col. 6, lines 1-45).

Regarding claims 10 and 26, Gupta discloses wherein the graphical user interface includes at least one page for exporting and importing authentication integration projects (Col. 2, lines 34-50).

Regarding claim 12, Gupta discloses wherein the server includes a data cache coupled to the database (Col. 13, lines 20-29).

Regarding claim 13, Gupta discloses wherein the server is programmed with a plurality of authentication modules for integrating respective target applications to the authentication system, and the server is programmed with an authentication module controller for directing user login requests to the respective authentication modules (Col. 11, lines 10-67, Col.12, lines 1-41).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 and Gupta hereinafter), in view of Khidekel et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0027527 and Khidekel hereinafter).

Teachings of Gupta with regard to limitations of claims 1 and 18 have been discussed previously.

Regarding claims 9 and 25, Gupta discloses wherein the administrative application is programmed to present a graphical user interface to the system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information, and the graphical user interface includes pages for selecting a natural language for conducting the login process (Col. 2, lines 15-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-14), for specifying inbound parameters to be received from the target application and outbound parameters to be sent to the target application, for configuring at least one authorization setting, for configuring at least one token (Col. 5, lines 43-67 and Col. 6, lines 1-45).

Gupta does not expressly disclose an encryption option for encrypting the token.

However, Khidekel discloses a token that can include a non-encrypted portion and an encrypted portion (Page 3, Par. 0034).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Gupta with teachings of

Khidekel because it would allow to include a token that can include a non-encrypted portion and an encrypted portion as disclosed by Khidekel. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Khidekel to provide for more security.

Claims 8, 11, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 and Gupta hereinafter), in view of Moshfeghi, (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,833).

Teachings of Gupta with regard to limitations of claims 1 and 18 have been discussed previously.

Regarding claims 8 and 24, Gupta does not expressly disclose creating and editing the configuration information and the graphical user interface including pages for listing active and inactive target applications integrated with the authentication system.

However, Moshfeghi discloses wherein the administrative application is programmed to present a graphical user interface to the system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information, and the graphical user interface includes pages for listing active and inactive target applications integrated with the authentication system, and pages for creating and editing a selected one of the target applications (Col. 3, lines 7-50).



Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Gupta with teachings of Moshfeghi because it would allow to include creating and editing the configuration information, and the graphical user interface includes pages for listing active and inactive target applications integrated with the authentication system, and pages for creating and editing a selected one of the target applications as disclosed by Moshfeghi. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Moshfeghi to dynamically create a personalized user home page listing all links allowed to the user (Moshfeghi, Col. 3, lines 25-42).

Regarding claim 11, Gupta does not expressly disclose creating and editing the configuration information, the administrative application includes a series of action modules for presenting respective pages of the graphical user interface to the system administrator.

However, Moshfeghi discloses wherein the administrative application is programmed to present a graphical user interface to the system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information, the administrative application includes a series of action modules for presenting respective pages of the graphical user interface to the system administrator, and the action modules are programmed for invoking business logic (Col.11, lines 5-67 and Col. 12, lines 1-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Gupta with teachings of Moshfeghi because it would allow to include a graphical user interface to the system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information as disclosed by Moshfeghi. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Moshfeghi to provide a method for changing the resource access and browsing function privileges of users by editing the content of their user profiles (Moshfeghi, Col. 3, lines 7-25).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gue et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0120121),  
Mitchell et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0216773),  
Barnett et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0111814), and  
Chan et al., (U.S. Publication No. (2004/0123144).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (571) 272-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Arezoo Sherkat  
Patent Examiner  
Group 2131  
Sep. 30, 2005



AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100